arXiv:1402.1673v2 [cs.NA] 16 Feb 2015

NON-ORTHOGONAL TENSOR DIAGONALIZATION, A TOOL FOR BLOCK TENSOR DECOMPOSITIONS *

PETR TICHAVSKÝ, ANH HUY PHAN AND ANDRZEJ CICHOCKI†

Abstract. This paper presents algorithms for non-orthogonal tensor diagonalization, which can be used for block tensor decomposition. The diagonalization can be performed along two or more tensor dimensions simultaneously. The method seeks for one diagonalizing matrix of determinant 1 for each mode that together convert a given tensor into a tensor that meets a block revealing condition. Perturbation analysis of the algorithm showing how small changes in the tensor translate in small changes of the diagonalization outcome is provided.

The algorithm has a low computational complexity, comparable to complexity of the fastest available canonical polyadic decomposition algorithms. For example, the diagonalization of order-3 tensor of the size $N \times N \times N$ has the complexity of the order $O(N^4)$ per iteration. If the tensor has a different shape, a Tucker compression should be applied prior to the diagonalization. The algorithm can be applied in cumulant-based independent subspace decomposition or for tensor deconvolution and feature extraction using the convolutive model.

Key words. Multilinear models; canonical polyadic decomposition; parallel factor analysis; block-term decomposition; joint matrix diagonalization

AMS subject classifications. 15A69, 15A23, 15A09, 15A29

1. Introduction.

Order-3 and higher-order data arrays need to be analyzed in diverse research areas such as chemistry, astronomy, and psychology [1]–[5]. The analyses can be done through finding multilinear dependencies among elements within arrays. The most popular model is Parallel Factor Analysis (PARAFAC), also coined Canonical Decomposition (CANDECOMP) or CP, which is an extension of low–rank decomposition of matrices to higher–order arrays (tensors). In signal processing, the tensor decompositions have become popular for their usefulness in blind source separation [6].

The concept of tensor diagonalization was first introduced by P. Comon and his co-workers [7, 8]. The tensor diagonalization in these papers was orthogonal, in other words it consisted in seeking orthogonal matrices that may transform the given tensor in a diagonal one. The method is based on Jacobi rotations. Similar title is of the conference paper [9], which refers to a two-sided diagonalization, which is falls in the area of approximate joint matrix diagonalization [17].

The tensor diagonalization studied in this paper is non-orthogonal, and should serve both for tensor diagonalization and block-diagonalization. The main part of the paper is concerned with a three sided diagonalization of order-3 tensor of a cubic shape, i.e. of the size $N \times N \times N$, where N is the tensor dimension.

There is a similarity between the tensor diagonalization and the CP decomposition. If the tensor's rank is smaller than or equal to N and the factor matrices are invertible, then the tensor diagonalization can be viewed, under certain condition, as a numerical procedure alternative to the CP decomposition.

The main motivation of our work, however, is the block-term decomposition, because in many applications the CP decomposition model is not quite appropriate

*This work was supported by the Czech Science Foundation through Project No. 14-13713S.

†Institute of Information Theory and Automation, Prague, Czech Republic; Brain Science Institute, RIKEN, Wakoshi, Japan. A. Cichocki is also with the Systems Research Institute Polish Academy of Sciences.

[12]. The block-term decomposition was developed by De Lathauwer and his coworkers [13, 14]. The decomposition means that the given tensor is rewritten as a sum of several tensors of the same size but a lower multilinear rank. The block term decomposition was used to propose a blind DS-CDMA receiver in [15].

To the best of our knowledge, reliable block-term decomposition algorithms exist for some very special cases such as $(L, L, 1)$ decomposition [16]. There is, in general, a very challenging problem of how to initialize a block-term decomposition algorithm without getting captured in false local minima of the criterion function. Another difficulty is that the appropriate block sizes might not be known in advance. We show in this paper how the tensor diagonalization can be used to advice a suitable block-term decomposition, i.e. find appropriate block sizes, and provide a reasonable initial block-term decomposition, which can be further improved by another algorithm, assuming fixed given block sizes, for example an Alternating Least Squares (ALS) [14].

The proposed method of the tensor diagonalization is closely related to approximate joint matrix diagonalization (AJD), see e.g. the survey paper [17]. Most of the AJD methods can be probably modified to nonsymmetric joint diagonalization, which is the other name for two-sided tensor diagonalization. If the approximate joint diagonalization is not appropriate for given set of matrices (tensor), one can seek for a joint block diagonalization of the set of the matrices, see e.g. papers of [20, 21, 22, 23]. The latter methods assume that sizes of blocks of the decomposition are known *a priori*. The only paper showing that the appropriate block structure (block sizes) can be deduced from given data is [24]. It deals with joint block diagonalization of set of symmetric matrices.

This paper extends the idea of [24] to joint block diagonalization of nonsymmetric matrices (two-sided diagonalization) and to three or more-sided tensor diagonalization. For the diagonalization itself we adopt the idea of the AJD algorithm [25], which constraints the diagonalizing matrices to have determinant one.

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the basic principles of the tensor diagonalization and shows its connection to CP decomposition as well as the block-term decomposition. In Section 3, an iterative algorithm is proposed to perform the diagonalization, either in the real or complex domains. Section 4 presents perturbation analysis of the algorithm. Section 5 deals with estimating a block structure of the tensor. Section 6 presents some numerical examples and applications, and Section 7 concludes the paper.

2. Tensor diagonalization principle. The main idea of the tensor diagonalization is to find so called demixing matrices that transform the given tensor to another tensor that is diagonally dominant. As we show later, this can also be a tool for the block-diagonalization.

Consider diagonalization of an order-3 tensor $\mathcal{T}$ of a cubic shape of dimension $N \times N \times N$ with elements t_{ijk}, $i, j, k = 1, \ldots, N$.

If the tensor has a different shape, we can always transform it to the required shape through the so called Tucker compression, which consists in finding orthogonal matrices $\mathbf{Q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2, \mathbf{Q}_3$ such that

$$\mathcal{T} \approx \mathcal{T}_C \times_1 \mathbf{Q}_1 \times_2 \mathbf{Q}_2 \times_3 \mathbf{Q}_3$$

where $\mathcal{T}_C$ is the compressed tensor of the required shape, and $\times_i$ denotes a mode-i tensor-matrix multiplication. The Tucker compression can be achieved by the HOOI algorithm [26] or by the Crank-Nicholson's optimization [27].



FIG. 1. *Three-sided tensor diagonalization transforms a tensor $\mathcal{T}$ to a diagonally dominant tensor $\mathcal{E}$ using demixing matrices* $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{B}$ *and* $\mathbf{C}$*:* $\mathcal{T} \times_1 \mathbf{A} \times_2 \mathbf{B} \times_3 \mathbf{C} = \mathcal{E}$.

The approximate diagonalization means seeking for matrices $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{C}$ of a size $N \times N$ such that the product

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{T} \times_1 \mathbf{A} \times_2 \mathbf{B} \times_3 \mathbf{C} \tag{2.1}$$

is approximately spatially diagonal as much as possible in a sense, see Fig. 1. A cubic-shape tensor $\mathcal{E}$ is called spatially diagonal if all its elements e_{ijk} except for the diagonal e_{iii}, $i = 1, \ldots, N$ are zero, symbolically, $\mathrm{off}(\mathcal{E}) = \mathbf{0}$ where $\mathrm{off}(\mathcal{X})$ is the operator that nullifies all spatially diagonal elements of a tensor $\mathcal{X}$. The multiplication in (2.1) can be written as

$$e_{ijk} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma=1}^{N} t_{\alpha\beta\gamma} a_{i\alpha} b_{j\beta} c_{k\gamma} \tag{2.2}$$

where e_{ijk}, $t_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$, $a_{i\alpha}$, $b_{j\beta}$ and $c_{k\gamma}$ are elements of the tensors $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{T}$ and matrices $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{C}$, respectively.

In this paper, the original objective was to measure degree of diagonality of the tensor $\mathcal{E}$ by Frobenius (ℓ_2) norm of $\mathrm{off}(\mathcal{E})$. Square of the norm is equal to sum of squared absolute values of the off-diagonal tensor elements. It is possible to consider the ℓ_1 norm of $\mathrm{off}(\mathcal{E})$ (sum of absolute values of the off-diagonal tensor elements) or its ℓ_0 norm (number of the nonzero elements). The latter two optimizations might be computationally expensive.

Instead of the minimization of $\|\mathrm{off}(\mathcal{E})\|_F$ we propose a modification of the method of [36] for approximate joint matrix diagonalization. The algorithm is based on a successive application of elementary rotations until *a decrease of $\|\mathit{off}(\mathcal{E})\|_F$ through the rotations is not possible*. Note that this is not equivalent to the direct minimization of $\|\mathrm{off}(\mathcal{E})\|_F$. For convenience, we consider only invertible transformations of the tensor, in particular we assume that the determinant of the transformation matrices is one [25],

$$\det \mathbf{A} = \det \mathbf{B} = \det \mathbf{C} = 1 \ . \tag{2.3}$$

Sign of the determinants is immaterial, because any change in sign of any of these matrices can be compensated by change of the sign of the core tensor $\mathcal{E}$. If $\mathcal{E}$ is diagonal, i.e., $\mathrm{off}(\mathcal{E}) = \mathbf{0}$, then (2.1) is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{E} \times_1 \widetilde{\mathbf{A}} \times_2 \widetilde{\mathbf{B}} \times_3 \widetilde{\mathbf{C}} \tag{2.4}$$

which is the CP decomposition of $\mathcal{T}$ with factor matrices $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{A}^{-1}$, $\widetilde{\mathbf{B}} = \mathbf{B}^{-1}$, and $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C}^{-1}$. These factor matrices will also be called *mixing*, their inversions $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{C}$ will be called *demixing* matrices, and tensor $\mathcal{E}$ is the *core* tensor.

The tensor diagonalization is not unique. Like in the CP decomposition, there is a permutation ambiguity, meaning that order of rows in $\mathbf{A}$ and accordingly in $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{C}$ can be arbitrary. Then, there is also a scale ambiguity.

2.1. Scaling. In this subsection we study the effect of changing scale in one or more modes to the tensor diagonalization through minimization of $\|\text{off}(\mathcal{E})\|_F$.

If $\text{off}(\mathcal{E}) = \mathbf{0}$, then $\mathcal{E}$ is diagonal and no more diagonalization is needed. In this case, it is possible to balance the condition number of the matrices $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{C}$ by multiplying them by diagonal matrices $\mathbf{D}_A$, $\mathbf{D}_B$ and $\mathbf{D}_C$ of determinant 1 so that the condition number of the of the transformed matrices $\mathbf{A}' = \mathbf{D}_A\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{B}' = \mathbf{D}_B\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{C}' = \mathbf{D}_C\mathbf{C}$ is optimized. In the optimum case, rows of the matrices $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{C}$ would have the same Euclidean norms. The corresponding transformed core tensor $\mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E} \times_1 \mathbf{D}_A \times_2 \mathbf{D}_B \times_3 \mathbf{D}_C$ remains diagonal, and the cost function $||\text{off}(\mathcal{E}')||_F = 0$ is not affected.

In the general case, scaling of the demixing matrices, however, affects the cost function $||\text{off}(\mathcal{E}')||_F$, namely when the core tensor is not fully diagonal.

Assume, for example, scaling in the first mode, i.e. set $\mathbf{D}_A = \text{diag}(d_1, \ldots, d_N)$ and $\mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E} \times_1 \mathbf{D}_A$. The condition $\det(\mathbf{D}_A) = 1$ is translated to $\prod_{i=1}^N d_i = 1$. We have

$$||\text{off}(\mathcal{E}')||_F^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N d_i^2 \eta_i \tag{2.5}$$

where η_i is the sum of squared magnitudes of the off-diagonal elements in the ith core tensor slice $\mathcal{E}(i,:,:)$, i.e.

$$\eta_i = \sum_{(k,\ell)\neq(i,i)}^N |e_{ik\ell}|^2 \ . \tag{2.6}$$

If it holds $\eta_i = \ldots = \eta_N > 0$, then the expression (2.5) is minimized at $d_1 = \ldots = d_N = 1$, i.e. only the trivial scaling preserves the minimum criterion, and all other scalings increase the criterion.

If all η_i, $i = 1, \ldots, N$ are positive, then the criterion minimizing α_i are such that all terms $d_i^2\eta_i$ are identical, i.e.

$$d_i^2 = (\prod_j \eta_j)^{1/N}/\eta_i \ . \tag{2.7}$$

If some of η_i, $i = 1, \ldots, N$ is zero while the others are nonzero, for example $\eta_1 = 0$ and $\eta_2 > 0$, then the minimum $||\text{off}(\mathcal{E}')||_F^2$ does not exist and the infimum of $||\text{off}(\mathcal{E}')||_F^2$ is zero.

The condition that some of η_i, $i = 1, \ldots, N$ is zero or close to zero may occur if the core tensor is block diagonal and some blocks are singletons (having size $1 \times 1 \times 1$). On the contrary, if the block sizes on the diagonal of the estimated core tensors are bigger, the condition $\eta_i = 0$ is unlike to happen, and the scaling can be used for minimizing $||\text{off}(\mathcal{E}')||_F^2$. However, note that the scaling of a tensor does not help in revealing diagonal or block-diagonal structure of the tensor.

These observations lead to the conclusion, that the simple minimization of $||\text{off}(\mathcal{E})||_F$ subject to $\det \mathbf{A} = \det \mathbf{B} = \det \mathbf{C} = 1$ need not necessary be the main target. A better

criterion would be the ℓ_0 norm of $\mathcal{E}$, i.e. number of nonzero elements in the tensor: this is, however, hard to minimize. We propose a *block revealing condition* (BRC) which serves as stopping criterion for the diagonalization algorithm. We also use the minimization of $||\text{off}(\mathcal{E})||_F$, but only as an instrument for a proof that the algorithm does not run in cycles, i.e. it converges.

2.2. Remarks on Orthogonal Diagonalization of Comon. The special case assuming that the mixing/demixing matrices are orthogonal (unitary in the complex case) can be solved by the algorithm of Comon and co-workers. The algorithm is based on subsequent application of Jacobi rotations. Each Jacobi rotation, specified by two indices (i, j), $i \neq j$, is a function of only eight tensor elements $t_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$, $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \{i, j\}$. The orthogonal rotation matrices are sought so that subtensor of the size $2 \times 2 \times 2$ is diagonalized in an optimum way.

It would be possible to consider a generalized version of this algorithm and find elementary rotations that exactly diagonalize the above subtensor. It is well known that each tensor of the size $2 \times 2 \times 2$ has at most rank 2 in the complex domain. The optimal rotations can be found in closed form.

The problem of this approach is that applying the elementary rotation to the whole tensor may not reduce any global cost function used to measure off-diagonality of the tensor. The resultant compound algorithm would not converge et al. A correct elementary rotation should not only compute with the subtensor of the size $2 \times 2 \times 2$ but it should involve all tensor elements that are affected by the rotation.

We conclude that a direct comparison of our algorithm TEDIA with the algorithm of Comon is hardly possible, the latter algorithm is much different, serves a different purpose and cannot be easily extended to become a competitor to TEDIA.

3. Algorithm TEDIA. The tensor diagonalization may proceed jointly in two modes or in three or more modes. In this section we describe three-way diagonalization of an order-3 tensor. Usually it is necessary to preprocess a given tensor by Tucker compression to a suitable format $N \times N \times N$.

The tensor diagonalization itself is achieved by a cyclic application of elementary rotations for all pairs of distinct indices $i, j = 1, \ldots, N$. Application of the $N(N+1)/2$ elementary rotations is called a sweep. Usually, the convergence is achieved in several to at most several hundreds of sweeps, see Section 6. Although each elementary rotation aims at minimizing $\|\text{off}(\mathcal{E})\|_F^2$, the iterative algorithm may not stop at the global minimum $\|\text{off}(\mathcal{E})\|_F^2$ subject to $\det(\mathbf{A}) = \det(\mathbf{B}) = \det(\mathbf{C}) = 1$. A further decrease of this criterion can be obtained, in general, by appropriate scaling. We propose to ignore this option. Instead, the algorithm ends at point of a zero gradient for each elementary rotation, which is "locally" optimum and represents the *Block Revealing Condition* (BRC).

Assume that $\mathcal{E}$ is a partially diagonalized tensor obtained during the optimization process. We seek for elementary rotation matrices $\mathbf{A}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, $\mathbf{B}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\mathbf{C}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ which have the same 0-1 elements as the $N \times N$ identity matrix except for the 2×2 submatrices with the row and column indices (i, j), $i \neq j$, of the form

$$[\mathbf{A}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta})]_{[ij],[ij]} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{1+\theta_1\theta_2} & \theta_2 \\ \theta_1 & \sqrt{1+\theta_1\theta_2} \end{bmatrix} \tag{3.1}$$

$$[\mathbf{B}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta})]_{[ij],[ij]} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{1+\theta_3\theta_4} & \theta_4 \\ \theta_3 & \sqrt{1+\theta_3\theta_4} \end{bmatrix} \tag{3.2}$$

$$[\mathbf{C}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta})]_{[ij],[ij]} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{1+\theta_5\theta_6} & \theta_6 \\ \theta_5 & \sqrt{1+\theta_5\theta_6} \end{bmatrix} \tag{3.3}$$

so that the Frobenius norm of off($\mathcal{E}'$) is minimized, where $\mathcal{E}'$ is the transformed tensor

$$\mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E}'(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathcal{E} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \times_2 \mathbf{B}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \times_3 \mathbf{C}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \tag{3.4}$$

and $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_6)^T$. Note that the elementary rotations are constructed so that their determinants are one. The matrix $\mathbf{A}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ depends only on the first two elements of the vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, and similarly $\mathbf{B}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\mathbf{C}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ depend only on the second and third pairs of elements of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. The core tensor and the factor matrices $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}$, $\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}$ are updated as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} &\longleftarrow \mathcal{E}'(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \qquad \widetilde{\mathbf{A}} \longleftarrow \widetilde{\mathbf{A}}\, \mathbf{A}_{ij}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \\ \widetilde{\mathbf{B}} &\longleftarrow \widetilde{\mathbf{B}}\, \mathbf{B}_{ij}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \qquad \widetilde{\mathbf{C}} \longleftarrow \widetilde{\mathbf{C}}\, \mathbf{C}_{ij}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is an approximate minimizer of the cost function. The elementary optimization problems are solved cyclically for all pairs (i, j), $i, j = 1, \ldots, N$, $i \neq j$. Note that each elementary rotation influences six slices of the tensor, as shown in Fig. 4. The rotation itself is performed as one step of the Gauss-Newton method: the parameter value $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is found as

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} = -\mathbf{H}^{-1}\mathbf{g} \tag{3.6}$$

where $\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{H}$ are the gradient and approximate Hessian of $\frac{1}{2}\|\text{off}(\mathcal{E}'(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\|_F^2$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ at the point $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{0}$. The optimization can proceed in the same way in the real-domain and in the complex domain, if $\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{H}$ are computed as

$$\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{J}^H \text{vec}(\text{off}(\mathcal{E})), \qquad \mathbf{H} = \mathbf{J}^H\mathbf{J} \tag{3.7}$$

where the superscript ^{H} denotes Hermitian transpose, and

$$\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{J}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \left.\frac{\partial \text{vec}(\text{off}(\mathcal{E}'(\boldsymbol{\theta})))}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}\right|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\mathbf{0}} \tag{3.8}$$

is the Jacobi matrix of the size $N^3 \times 6$ evaluated at $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{0}$. Similar expressions were used to implement the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm for CP decomposition in the complex domain in [30].

In TEDIA, it is not necessary to work with the Jacobi matrix $\mathbf{J}$ explicitly, because it is of large size, but thanks to its special form (see Appendix A), we can compute the gradient and Hessian directly. A straightforward computation leads to the result

$$\mathbf{g}^{(i,j)} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{ij} - e^*_{jii}e_{iii} \\ \lambda^*_{ij} - e^*_{ijj}e_{jjj} \\ \mu_{ij} - e^*_{iji}e_{iii} \\ \mu^*_{ij} - e^*_{jij}e_{jjj} \\ \nu_{ij} - e^*_{iij}e_{iii} \\ \nu^*_{ij} - e^*_{jji}e_{jjj} \end{bmatrix} \tag{3.9}$$

where * denotes the complex conjugate, the upper index (i, j) of $\mathbf{g}$ specifies the elementary rotation,

$$\lambda_{ij} = \text{vec}(e_{j,:,:})^H \text{vec}(e_{i,:,:}) \tag{3.10}$$

$$\mu_{ij} = \text{vec}(e_{:,j,:})^H \text{vec}(e_{:,i,:}) \tag{3.11}$$

$$\nu_{ij} = \text{vec}(e_{:,:,j})^H \text{vec}(e_{:,:,i}) \tag{3.12}$$

$$\mathbf{H}^{(i,j)} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{jj} - |e_{jii}|^2 & 0 & \mathbf{u}_{ji}^H \mathbf{u}_{ij} - e_{jii}^* e_{iji} & \mathbf{u}_{jj}^H \mathbf{u}_{ii} & \mathbf{v}_{ji}^H \mathbf{v}_{ij} - e_{jii}^* e_{iji} & \mathbf{v}_{jj}^H \mathbf{v}_{ii} \\ 0 & \lambda_{ii} - |e_{ijj}|^* & \mathbf{u}_{ii}^H \mathbf{u}_{jj} & \mathbf{u}_{ij}^H \mathbf{u}_{ji} - e_{ijj}^* e_{jij} & \mathbf{v}_{ii}^H \mathbf{v}_{jj} & \mathbf{v}_{ij}^H \mathbf{v}_{ji} - e_{ijj}^* e_{jji} \\ \star & \star & \mu_{jj} - |e_{iji}|^2 & 0 & \mathbf{w}_{ji}^H \mathbf{w}_{ij} - e_{iji}^* e_{iij} & \mathbf{w}_{jj}^H \mathbf{w}_{ii} \\ \star & \star & 0 & \mu_{ii} - |e_{jij}|^2 & \mathbf{w}_{ii}^H \mathbf{w}_{jj} & \mathbf{w}_{ij}^H \mathbf{w}_{ji} - e_{jij}^* e_{jji} \\ \star & \star & \star & \star & \nu_{jj} - |e_{iij}|^2 & 0 \\ \star & \star & \star & \star & 0 & \nu_{ii} - |e_{jji}|^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$\star$ stands for complex conjugate elements of the upper triangular part, $\mathbf{u}_{ij} = [e_{ij1}, \ldots, e_{ijN}]^T$, $\mathbf{v}_{ij} = [e_{i1j}, \ldots, e_{iNj}]^T$, and $\mathbf{w}_{ij} = [e_{1ij}, \ldots, e_{Nij}]^T$ for $i, j = 1, \ldots, N$.

We propose to do a single step of the Gauss-Newton method for each pair (i, j) only in each sweep, provided that the cost function decreases.

In some cases it may happen, however, that the cost function increases, or there is some other problem, namely in optimization in the real domain: some of the conditions $1 + \theta_1\theta_2 \geq 0$, $1 + \theta_3\theta_4 \geq 0$, $1 + \theta_5\theta_6 \geq 0$ may be violated. In the latter cases we suggest not to accept such step, but to switch to the damped Gauss-Newton method, and apply an update

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} = -(\mathbf{H} + \mu \mathbf{I}_6)^{-1} \mathbf{g} \tag{3.13}$$

where μ is a suitable positive constant such that the regularity conditions are fulfilled and the criterion decreases. Optionally it is possible to add a few more steps of the damped Gauss-Newton method for the same (i, j) until the cost function stops reducing.

The computational complexity of building one Hessian matrix and the gradient is $O(N^2)$, the solution of the 6×6 system has a complexity of $O(1)$. Since there are $O(N^2)$ pairs (i, j), each sweep needs $O(N^4)$ operations.

The sweeps are iterated until the Euclidean norm of optimum parameter θ in every elementary rotation becomes smaller than an user chosen constant, say $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$. The number of the sweeps needed to achieve a convergence depends, indeed, on the dimension of the problem, presence of additive noise, and other factors. The algorithm does not require any special initialization except for the Tucker compression, if needed. Then, it can start, for example, with $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{I}$. The algorithm is summarized in Table 1.

3.1. Block revealing condition (BRC). BRC is the condition under which the optimum elementary rotations are all trivial. The condition says that all gradients in (3.9) are zero, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(k,\ell) \neq (i,i)} e_{ik\ell} e_{jk\ell}^* &= 0 \\ \sum_{(k,\ell) \neq (i,i)} e_{ki\ell} e_{kj\ell}^* &= 0 \\ \sum_{(k,\ell) \neq (i,i)} e_{k\ell i} e_{k\ell j}^* &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

for all $i, j = 1, \ldots, N$, $i \neq j$. The stationarity condition is, indeed, fulfilled if the tensor $\mathcal{E}$ is diagonal – but not only in this case. For example, the $2 \times 2 \times 2$ tensor

$$\mathcal{E}_{01} = \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{array} \right) \tag{3.15}$$

TABLE 1
Algorithm TEDIA Summary

Input: Tensor $\mathcal{T}$ of size $N \times N \times N$, stopping constant ε
Output: Mixing matrices $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$; Core tensor $\mathcal{E}$
Initialize: $\mathcal{E} := \mathcal{T}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \tilde{\mathbf{B}} = \tilde{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{I}$
Repeat
  $\theta_{max} = 0$
  for $i, j = 1, \ldots, N$, $i \neq j$
    $\boldsymbol{\theta} = -[\mathbf{H}^{(i,j)}]^{-1}\mathbf{g}^{(i,j)}$
    $\mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \times_2 \mathbf{B}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \times_3 \mathbf{C}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$
    If $\|\text{off}(\mathcal{E}')\|_F > \|\text{off}(\mathcal{E})\|_F$ or $\mathbf{H}^{ij}$ is singular
      $\mu = \min \text{diag}(\mathbf{H}^{ij})$
    Repeat
      $\boldsymbol{\theta} = -[\mathbf{H}^{(i,j)} + \mu\mathbf{I}_6]^{-1}\mathbf{g}^{(i,j)}$
      $\mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \times_2 \mathbf{B}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \times_3 \mathbf{C}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$
      $\mu = 2\mu$
    until $\|\text{off}(\mathcal{E}')\|_F < \|\text{off}(\mathcal{E})\|_F$
    Update $\mathcal{E}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ via (3.5)
    $\theta_{max} = \max\{\theta_{max}, \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|\}$
  end
until $\theta_{max} < \varepsilon$

represents such a point. Note that this tensor is not diagonal, it has rank 2 and can be diagonalized exactly. However, it appears that the tensor $\mathcal{E}_{01}$ is unstable point of the diagonalization. If some of the tensor elements are slightly changed, TEDIA begins to converge to a solution with an exactly diagonal core tensor.

It would be useful to have theoretical guarantees that if the core tensor obeys the BRC, it always reveals the optimum block structure of the tensor (i.e. structure with the smallest possible blocks). The example (3.15) shows that this is not fulfilled. We still hope in a hypothesis that all such "false solutions" are unstable. Given a solution of diagonalization, one can check if it is stable or not - e.g. using the perturbation analysis in next section. Since it is well known that CP tensor decomposition is a hard task [38], it is not guaranteed that any stable diagonalization gives the smallest possible blocks either. Our extensive simulations, see Section 6, confirm the hypothesis.

4. Perturbation analysis of TEDIA. In this section we analyze influence of small perturbations of the tensor elements to the outcome of the diagonalization algorithm. For simplicity we consider only diagonalization in real domain, and tensors with full multilinear rank, (N, N, N). We show the difference between minimization of $\|\text{off}(\mathcal{E})\|_F$ and application of TEDIA.

4.1. Analysis of minimizing $\|\text{off}(\mathcal{E})\|_F$. Assume that the demixing matrices $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}$ are obtained by minimizing $\|\text{off}(\mathcal{E})\|_F$ where $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}) = \mathcal{T} \times_1 \mathbf{A} \times_2 \mathbf{B} \times_3 \mathbf{C}$ subject to the condition $\det \mathbf{A} = \det \mathbf{B} = \det \mathbf{C} = 1$. Recall that the minimization can be obtained by alternating the scaling optimization described in Section 2 and the TEDIA algorithm in Section 3 in iterative manner.

Next assume that $\mathbf{A}', \mathbf{B}', \mathbf{C}'$ are obtained by minimizing $\|\text{off}(\mathcal{E}')\|_F$ where $\mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E}'(\mathcal{T}', \mathbf{A}', \mathbf{B}', \mathbf{C}') = \mathcal{T}' \times_1 \mathbf{A}' \times_2 \mathbf{B}' \times_3 \mathbf{C}'$ subject to the condition $\det \mathbf{A}' = \det \mathbf{B}' = \det \mathbf{C}' = 1$, $\mathcal{T}' = \mathcal{T} + \delta\mathcal{T}$, and $\delta\mathcal{T}$ is a small perturbation of the input tensor $\mathcal{T}$. We

are interested in small perturbations and not in the permutation ambiguity. Therefore we assume that the optimization for $\mathbf{A}', \mathbf{B}', \mathbf{C}'$ is initialized by $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}$. We wish to see how the small perturbation in $\mathcal{T}$ translates in a small perturbation of the core tensor $\delta\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}' - \mathcal{E}$ and increments of the estimated demixing matrices $\delta\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}' - \mathbf{A}$, $\delta\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B}' - \mathbf{B}$ and $\delta\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}' - \mathbf{C}$.

There are two kinds of optimality conditions: BRC (3.14), which represents $3N(N-1)$ equations, and optimality conditions for scaling in all three modes,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(k,\ell)\neq(i,i)} |e_{1k\ell}|^2 &= \ldots = \sum_{(k,\ell)\neq(i,i)} |e_{Nk\ell}|^2 \\ \sum_{(k,\ell)\neq(i,i)} |e_{k1\ell}|^2 &= \ldots = \sum_{(k,\ell)\neq(i,i)} |e_{kN\ell}|^2 \\ \sum_{(k,\ell)\neq(i,i)} |e_{k\ell 1}|^2 &= \ldots = \sum_{(k,\ell)\neq(i,i)} |e_{k\ell N}|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

for $i = 1, \ldots, N$, i.e. it is $3N-3$ equations, and finally there are 3 conditions

$$\det \mathbf{A} = \det \mathbf{B} = \det \mathbf{C} = 1 \ . \tag{4.2}$$

In total we have $3N^2$ conditions for $3N^2$ variables, elements of $\delta\mathbf{A}, \delta\mathbf{B}, \delta\mathbf{C}$. Perturbation analysis of these conditions gives a linear dependence of $\delta\mathbf{A}, \delta\mathbf{B}, \delta\mathbf{C}$ on elements of $\delta\mathcal{T}$. For example, the first-order perturbation of the condition (3.14) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(k,\ell)\neq(i,i)} [\delta e_{ik\ell} e^\star_{jk\ell} + e_{ik\ell}\delta e^\star_{jk\ell}] &= 0 \\ \sum_{(k,\ell)\neq(i,i)} [\delta e_{ki\ell} e^\star_{kj\ell} + e_{ki\ell}\delta e^\star_{kj\ell}] &= 0 \\ \sum_{(k,\ell)\neq(i,i)} [\delta e_{k\ell i} e^\star_{k\ell j} + e_{k\ell i}\delta e^\star_{k\ell j}] &= 0 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

The perturbation of the scaling optimality condition (4.1) is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(k,\ell)\neq(i,i)} [\delta e_{ik\ell} e^\star_{ik\ell} + e_{ik\ell}\delta e^\star_{ik\ell}] &= \sum_{(k,\ell)\neq(1,1)} [\delta e_{1k\ell} e^\star_{1k\ell} + e_{1k\ell}\delta e^\star_{1k\ell}] \\ \sum_{(k,\ell)\neq(i,i)} [\delta e_{ki\ell} e^\star_{ki\ell} + e_{ki\ell}\delta e^\star_{ki\ell}] &= \sum_{(k,\ell)\neq(1,1)} [\delta e_{k1\ell} e^\star_{k1\ell} + e_{k1\ell}\delta e^\star_{k1\ell}] \\ \sum_{(k,\ell)\neq(i,i)} [\delta e_{k\ell i} e^\star_{k\ell i} + e_{k\ell i}\delta e^\star_{k\ell i}] &= \sum_{(k,\ell)\neq(1,1)} [\delta e_{k\ell 1} e^\star_{k\ell 1} + e_{k\ell 1}\delta e^\star_{k\ell 1}] \ . \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

for $i = 2, \ldots, N$.

The perturbation of the constraint on the determinant (4.2) can be derived from Taylor series of determinant

$$\det(\mathbf{A} + \delta\mathbf{A}) = [1 + \mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{A}^{-1}\delta\mathbf{A})] \det \mathbf{A} + O(\|\delta\mathbf{A}\|_F^2) \ .$$

Therefore the perturbations obey the equations

$$\mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{A}^{-1}\delta\mathbf{A}) = \mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{B}^{-1}\delta\mathbf{B}) = \mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{C}^{-1}\delta\mathbf{C}) = 0 \ . \tag{4.5}$$

The relation between $\delta\mathcal{E}$ and $\delta\mathcal{T}, \delta\mathbf{A}, \delta\mathbf{B}$ and $\delta\mathbf{C}$ is

$$e_{ijk} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} t_{\alpha\beta\gamma} a_{i\alpha} b_{j\beta} c_{k\gamma} \tag{4.6}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta e_{ijk} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} [&\delta t_{\alpha\beta\gamma} a_{i\alpha} b_{j\beta} c_{k\gamma} + t_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \delta a_{i\alpha} b_{j\beta} c_{k\gamma} \\ &+ t_{\alpha\beta\gamma} a_{i\alpha} \delta b_{j\beta} c_{k\gamma} + t_{\alpha\beta\gamma} a_{i\alpha} b_{j\beta} \delta c_{k\gamma}] \ .\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Inserting (4.6) and (4.7) in (4.3) and (4.4) and applying (4.5) we get a linear system

$$\mathbf{H}_1 \delta\boldsymbol{\Theta} = \mathbf{H}_2 \mathrm{vec}(\delta\mathcal{T}) \tag{4.8}$$

where $\delta\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ is a perturbation of the parameter $\boldsymbol{\Theta} = (\mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{A})^T, \mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{B})^T, \mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{C})^T)^T$ and $\mathbf{H}_1$ and $\mathbf{H}_2$ are matrices of the sizes $3N^2 \times 3N^2$ and $3N^2 \times N^3$, respectively. Now, if elements of $\delta\mathcal{T}$ are modeled as mutually independent with zero mean and variance σ^2, and $\mathbf{H}_1$ is invertible, then the covariance matrix of the error is

$$\mathrm{cov}[\delta\boldsymbol{\Theta}] = \mathrm{E}[\delta\boldsymbol{\Theta}\delta\boldsymbol{\Theta}^T] = \sigma^2 \mathbf{H}_1^{-1} \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{H}_2^T \mathbf{H}_1^{-T} \ . \tag{4.9}$$

Explicit form of the matrices $\mathbf{H}_1$ and $\mathbf{H}_2$ is not shown here to save place, because it is not that important as analysis of TEDIA. They are slightly different from the matrices presented in Appendix B.

4.2. Analysis of TEDIA. While the minimization of $\|\mathrm{off}(\mathcal{E})\|_F$ is locally unique, in general, the estimator using the BRC only is not. Note that the estimated parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ has $3N^2$ entries, the BRC contains of $3N^2 - 3N$ equations only. The missing $3N$ equations that determine the perturbations $\delta\mathbf{A}$, $\delta\mathbf{B}$ and $\delta\mathbf{C}$ are obtained from the way how the algorithm works.

In each sweep, the algorithm optimizes $3N^2 - 3N$ variables. Given an estimate of the core tensor $\mathcal{E}$, the algorithm seeks for matrices $\Delta\mathbf{A}, \Delta\mathbf{B}$, and $\Delta\mathbf{C}$, that have the diagonal filled with 1's (second-order terms are neglected for the purpose of the analysis) such that $\|\mathrm{off}(\mathcal{E} \times_1 \Delta\mathbf{A} \times_2 \Delta\mathbf{B} \times_3 \Delta\mathbf{C})\|_F$ is minimized. The update of the mixing matrix $\mathbf{A}$ is $\mathbf{A} + \delta\mathbf{A} = \Delta\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}$, and it follows that $\mathrm{diag}(\delta\mathbf{A}\,\mathbf{A}^{-1}) = \mathbf{0}$. Therefore the $3n$ missing equations that determine $\delta\mathbf{A}$, $\delta\mathbf{B}$ and $\delta\mathbf{C}$ can be expressed as

$$\mathrm{diag}(\delta\mathbf{A}\,\mathbf{A}^{-1}) = \mathrm{diag}(\delta\mathbf{B}\,\mathbf{B}^{-1}) = \mathrm{diag}(\delta\mathbf{C}\,\mathbf{C}^{-1}) = \mathbf{0} \ . \tag{4.10}$$

Note that this condition is compatible with the perturbation (4.5) of the constraint $\det\mathbf{A} = \det\mathbf{B} = \det\mathbf{C} = 1$. The condition (4.10) implies (4.5).

Again, we can summarize the relation between the perturbations of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and the perturbation of the tensor $\mathcal{T}$ in the form (4.8), where $\mathbf{H}_1$ and $\mathbf{H}_2$ are matrices of the sizes $3N^2 \times 3N^2$ and $3N^2 \times N^3$ again, with slightly different form than the analysis of minimizing $\|\mathrm{off}(\mathcal{E})\|_F$. Explicit form of these matrices is given in Appendix B. Note that the matrices are functions of the tensor $\mathcal{T}$ and all three demixing matrices $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}$.

The outcome of the diagonalization is a smooth function of the tensor elements locally, if the matrix $\mathbf{H}_1$ is regular. Regularity of $\mathbf{H}_1$ can be checked as a concluding step of TEDIA. Usually, $\mathbf{H}_1$ is regular. However, in some cases $\mathbf{H}_1$ can be singular; it follows that the diagonalization may not be stable, as it is not stable for the tensor $\mathcal{E}_{01}$ in (3.15). (It is easy to check that $\mathbf{H}_1$ is singular for $\mathcal{E}_{01}$.) Therefore it might be that a better solution can be obtained in another run of the algorithm starting from

a different (random) initial point. Success of the diagonalization, however, should be measured ℓ_0 norm (number of nonzero elements) of off($\mathcal{E}$) rather than its ℓ_2 norm $\|\text{off}(\mathcal{E})\|_F$, because the Frobenius norm might be misleading due to the scaling issue. The solution with the smaller ℓ_0 norm will, after permuting the coordinates, more likely to get smaller blocks in the core tensor, but it may not necessarily have the smaller ℓ_2 norm.

Given the matrices $\mathbf{H}_1$ and $\mathbf{H}_2$ we can study stability of the tensor diagonalization in terms of angular differences between columns of the estimated demixing matrices $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{A}^{-1}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{B}} = \mathbf{B}^{-1}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C}^{-1}$. We prefer to study angular errors of columns of $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}, \tilde{\mathbf{B}}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ to angular errors of rows of $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}$, because this approach is compatible with the Cramér-Rao analysis of the CP tensor decomposition [35]. Note that the first-order perturbations of $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}, \tilde{\mathbf{B}}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ obey

$$\delta\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = -\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\delta\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}, \quad \delta\tilde{\mathbf{B}} = -\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\delta\mathbf{B}\tilde{\mathbf{B}}, \quad \delta\tilde{\mathbf{C}} = -\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\delta\mathbf{C}\tilde{\mathbf{C}} \ . \tag{4.11}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec}(\delta\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) &= -(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^T \otimes \tilde{\mathbf{A}})\text{vec}(\delta\mathbf{A}) \\ \text{vec}(\delta\tilde{\mathbf{B}}) &= -(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \otimes \tilde{\mathbf{B}})\text{vec}(\delta\mathbf{B}) \\ \text{vec}(\delta\tilde{\mathbf{C}}) &= -(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^T \otimes \tilde{\mathbf{C}})\text{vec}(\delta\mathbf{C}) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Let $\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{c}_i$ be the ith column of $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}, \tilde{\mathbf{B}}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}$, respectively, $\delta\mathbf{a}_i, \delta\mathbf{b}_i, \delta\mathbf{c}_i$ be their perturbations. Then the angular difference between $\mathbf{a}_i$ and $\mathbf{a}_i + \delta\mathbf{a}_i$ obeys

$$\cos\alpha_i = \frac{\mathbf{a}_i^T(\mathbf{a}_i + \delta\mathbf{a}_i)}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|\,\|\mathbf{a}_i + \delta\mathbf{a}_i\|} \approx 1 - \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\|\delta\mathbf{a}_i\|^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|^2} - \frac{(\mathbf{a}_i^T\delta\mathbf{a}_i)^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|^4}\right)$$

i.e.

$$\alpha_i^2 \approx \frac{\|\delta\mathbf{a}_i\|^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|^2} - \frac{(\mathbf{a}_i^T\delta\mathbf{a}_i)^2}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|^4} \ .$$

The approximations are valid for small $\delta\mathbf{a}_i$. The last approximation can also be written as

$$\alpha_i^2 \approx \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|^2}\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Pi}_{ai}(\delta\mathbf{a}_i\delta\mathbf{a}_i^T))$$

where $\mathbf{\Pi}_{ai}$ is the projection operator

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_{ai} = \mathbf{I} - \frac{\mathbf{a}_i\mathbf{a}_i^T}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|^2} \ .$$

If the tensor perturbation $\delta\mathcal{T}$ is modeled as i.i.d. with variance σ^2, it is possible to estimate the mean square angular errors of $\mathbf{a}_i$:

$$\text{E}[\alpha_i^2] \approx \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{a}_i\|^2}\text{tr}(\mathbf{\Pi}_{ai}\text{cov}[\delta\mathbf{a}_i])$$

where $\text{cov}(\delta\mathbf{a}_i)$ is a submatrix of $\text{cov}(\text{vec}(\delta\tilde{\mathbf{A}}))$,

$$\text{cov}(\text{vec}(\delta\tilde{\mathbf{A}})) = (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^T \otimes \tilde{\mathbf{A}})\text{cov}(\text{vec}(\delta\mathbf{A}))(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^T \otimes \tilde{\mathbf{A}})^T$$

and $\text{cov}(\text{vec}(\delta\mathbf{A}))$ is a submatrix of $\text{cov}(\delta\mathbf{\Theta})$ in (4.9).



FIG. 2. *Mean-square angular estimation errors of columns of the factor matrices* $\mathbf{A}$ *(left diagram) and* $\mathbf{B}$ *(right diagram) as a function of scalar product of the columns of* $\mathbf{A}$*. The MSAE is higher for components with a lower amplitude and lower otherwise. The amplitudes (core tensor diagonal elements) are 1,2,3,4,5.*

4.3. Example. Consider a diagonalization of rank-5 tensor of dimension $5\times5\times5$ corrupted by additive Gaussian noise. The ideal core tensor is taken diagonal with the diagonal elements 1,2,3,4,5. The factor matrices will be given as $\mathbf{A} = \varepsilon\mathbf{1}_{5\times5} + \gamma\mathbf{I}$, $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{I}$, where $\mathbf{1}_{5\times5}$ is a matrix filled with ones, and the scalar parameters ε and γ are chosen so that the matrix has unit-norm columns, and mutual correlations of the columns is $c \in [0, 1]$. The parameter c represents colinearity of columns in $\mathbf{A}$. Note that colinearity of columns is the main factor which influences how computationaly hard the CP decomposition is [35]. A short computation gives $\varepsilon = (\sqrt{1-c+Nc} - \sqrt{1-c})/N$ and $\gamma = \sqrt{1-(N-1)\varepsilon^2} - \varepsilon$. With this choice of the parameters, the first factor matrix has mutually correlated columns, and the other two matrices are orthogonal.

We compare theoretical performance of TEDIA and the corresponding Cramér-Rao-induced lower bound on the mean square angular error of the individual columns of the factor matrices [35], if the tensor is corrupted by an i.i.d. Gaussian noise of variance 1, and with empirical performance of TEDIA, obtained in 200 independent trials for each c at SNR=30 dB. The SNR in dB is defined as $10\log_{10}(N^3\sigma^2/\|\mathcal{T}\|_F^2)$. Results are plotted in Figure 2.

We can see that for $c = 0$ (orthogonal factor matrices) the performance of TEDIA achieves the CRIB. For $c > 0$, estimation of matrix $\mathbf{A}$ remains unaffected, but estimation of matrices $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{C}$ becomes harder and the error increases, as c grows. There is a gap between the performance of TEDIA and the CRIB. TEDIA was never claimed to be statistically optimum estimator for the CP decomposition model. The main motivation for the diagonalization is the block term decomposition.

The empirical performance of TEDIA follows the theoretical prediction for $c \leq 0.7$. For higher c, agreement between the theoretical and empirical MSAE is obtained only if the variance of the additive noise is reduced. The diagonalization is perfect if there is no noise.

5. Diagonalization of block-diagonal tensors. In [24] it was shown that an ordinary approximate joint diagonalization algorithm for matrices can be used to obtain a joint block diagonalization of these matrices. It appears that similar link exists between the tensor diagonalization and tensor block-term decomposition. It is



FIG. 3. *Tensor block-diagonalization transforms a tensor $\mathcal{T}$ to a block-diagonal tensor $\mathcal{E}$ by factor matrices* $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{B}$ *and* $\mathbf{C}$*:* $\mathcal{T} \times_1 \mathbf{A} \times_2 \mathbf{B} \times_3 \mathbf{C} = \mathcal{E}$.

possible that a given tensor is not fully diagonalizable but is block-diagonalizable, as it is shown schematically in Fig. 3. We can assume that the diagonal blocks cannot be diagonalized any further, because their tensor ranks exceed their dimensions, and that each of the blocks separately obeys the BRC (3.14). It can easily be proven that a compound block diagonal tensor obeys the BRC as well: If i, j belong to the distinct blocks, the condition is trivially fulfilled thanks to the block-diagonal structure of $\mathcal{E}$. If i, j belong to the same block, the condition is fulfilled because the smaller block itself was assumed to be a stationary point of the diagonalization. The diagonalization algorithm may terminate here. Such block-diagonal decomposition may be of practical interest, because it represents a more compact form of the tensor data and it may also be relevant for interpretation of the data. Note that the order of rows in matrices $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{C}$ might be arbitrary, giving an equivalent diagonalization. In other words, if (2.1) holds and $\pi(\cdot)$ is an arbitrary permutation of $(1, \ldots, N)$, then

$$\mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{T} \times_1 \mathbf{A}' \times_2 \mathbf{B}' \times_3 \mathbf{C}' \tag{5.1}$$

where $\mathcal{E}'$, $\mathbf{A}'$, $\mathbf{B}'$ and $\mathbf{C}'$ have elements $e'_{ijk} = e_{\pi(i),\pi(j),\pi(k)}$, $a'_{i,\alpha} = a_{\pi(i),\alpha}$, $b'_{j,\beta} = b_{\pi(j),\beta}$, and $c'_{k\gamma} = c_{\pi(k),\gamma}$, respectively, for $i, j, k, \alpha, \beta, \gamma = 1, \ldots, N$, is an equivalent diagonalization. It follows that if the block structure exists in the original tensor, the block structure may not be apparent after a mixing and demixing (diagonalization) unless a suitable permutation π is found. The permutation should be the same in all modes in order to guarantee that all diagonal elements of the original tensor will appear on the diagonal of the permuted tensor.

The degree of diagonality or block-diagonality of a tensor $\mathcal{E}$ can be visually judged via three matrices, $\mathbf{F}_1$, $\mathbf{F}_2$ and $\mathbf{F}_3$ of size $N \times N$, having elements

$$(\mathbf{F}_1)_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{N} |e_{kij}|, \quad (\mathbf{F}_2)_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{N} |e_{ikj}|, \quad (\mathbf{F}_3)_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{N} |e_{ijk}| \ . \tag{5.2}$$

The tensor $\mathcal{E}$ is diagonal (block-diagonal) if and only if the three matrices are diagonal (block-diagonal). Alternatively, it is possible to judge diagonality/block-diagonality using the sum

$$\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}_1 + \mathbf{F}_2 + \mathbf{F}_3 \ . \tag{5.3}$$

If $\mathbf{F}$ is block-diagonal, its $(i, j)-$th element f_{ij} is zero if i, j belong to different blocks, and it might be strictly positive if they belong to the same block. The order of the columns in the factor matrices is random in general, however. Then, f_{ij} or its

symmetrized version $f_{ij} + f_{ji}$ may be considered as a measure of similarity between columns i and j in the mixing matrices, or an indicator of "probability" that they belong to the same block.

Such permutation can be found e.g. using the well known reverse Cuthill-McKee algorithm (RCM)[37], implemented in Matlab$^{\text{TM}}$ as function *symrcm*. The RCM algorithm, applied to the matrix $\mathbf{F}$, reveals ordering of the columns and rows such that the reordered matrix is block-diagonal.

In the noisy case, when the blocks of the core tensors are fuzzy, we have better experiences with standard clustering methods, such as *hierarchical clustering with the average-linking policy* [33], which take $\mathbf{F}$ for a similarity matrix. In short, the algorithm begins with a trivial clustering which consists of N singletons, and in each subsequent step it merges the two clusters that have the maximum average similarity between their members. The algorithm proceeds until the average mutual similarity between the clusters is sufficiently small; in the worst case, all clusters are merged into a single one.

Another observation is that the diagonal blocks can be singletons $1 \times 1 \times 1$; otherwise they would usually be of a size larger than $2 \times 2 \times 2$. Especially, in the complex domain, the diagonal blocks never have the size $2 \times 2 \times 2$, because any tensor of the size has rank at most two [32]. It means that such a block can always be transformed to a fully diagonal form in that domain, unless it is rank-deficient. Similar situation exists for blocks of the size $3 \times 3 \times 3$ and $4 \times 4 \times 4$. We have seen in simulations that applying TEDIA with scaling i.e. minimizing $\|\text{off}(\mathcal{E})\|_F$ to such blocks produces sequences of partially diagonalized core tensors with $\|\text{off}(\mathcal{E})\|_F \to 0$. TEDIA without the scaling is able to reveal such blocks.

Finally, we note that TEDIA is probably not the only diagonalization algorithm able to reveal the block structure of the tensor, if the structure exists in the original tensor. We conducted some experiments with the plain CP decomposition. A block-diagonal tensor (we assume again the size $N \times N \times N$) was processed to find the best fitting approximation $\mathcal{T} \approx \mathcal{D} \times_1 \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \times_2 \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \times_3 \tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ where $\mathcal{D}$ is diagonal. We observed that if the factor matrices $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}, \tilde{\mathbf{B}}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ are all invertible, then the product $\mathcal{T} \times_1 \tilde{\mathbf{A}}^{-1} \times_2 \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{-1} \times_3 \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{-1}$ has the expected block structure, provided that a suitable permutation of the tensor coordinates (the same in all modes) is applied, like in the TEDIA algorithm.

The problem with this usage of the CP decomposition is that it does not guarantee invertibility of the factor matrices. In fact, in demixing of a mixed block-diagonal tensor the estimated factor matrices are typically very badly conditioned, and the outcome of the block-diagonalization is numerically unstable. Therefore the CP decomposition-based block-diagonalization is not included in our simulation study.

It would be nice to have theoretical guarantees that all block term decompositions of a given tensor are equivalent up to an order of the blocks and choice of bases in the partitioned factor matrices. Unfortunately, theoretical results of this kind are still lacking. Simulations, however, are very promising in this sense.

6. Examples. In this example we test accuracy of block-diagonalization of a noisy tensor in estimating subspaces of the factor matrices that belong to the individual blocks.

The initial tensor of the size $15 \times 15 \times 15$ is block diagonal, with three random blocks along its main diagonal, each of the size $5 \times 5 \times 5$. These blocks were computed as $(\mathcal{I}_5 + \mathbf{1}_{5\times5\times5}) \times_1 \mathbf{Q}_1 \times_2 \mathbf{Q}_2 \times_3 \mathbf{Q}_3$, where $\mathcal{I}_5$ is a diagonal tensor having 1's in its main diagonal, $\mathbf{1}_{5\times5\times5}$ is a tensor filled with 1's, and $\mathbf{Q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2, \mathbf{Q}_3$ are random orthogonal matrices of the size 5×5. Such blocks have rank 6 and cannot be fully diagonalized

nor block-diagonalized.

The initial tensor is the desired core tensor $\mathcal{E}$. The mixing matrices $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ are obtained as products $\mathbf{Q}_A\mathbf{A}_c$, $\mathbf{Q}_B\mathbf{A}_c$ and $\mathbf{Q}_C\mathbf{A}_c$, respectively, where $\mathbf{Q}_A, \mathbf{Q}_B, \mathbf{Q}_C$ are random orthogonal matrices of the size 15×15, and $\mathbf{A}_c = \varepsilon\mathbf{1}_{15\times 15} + \gamma\mathbf{I}_{15}$ is a fixed matrix having parameter c to control colinearity of columns of the demixing matrices, like the one in Section 4. For $c = 0$, the matrices are orthogonal, and for $c \to 1$ the matrices are nearly rank 1, and the diagonalization becomes hard. The tensor $\mathcal{T}$ is computed according to (4). Next, a Gaussian noise is added according to pre-specified SNR's.

Accuracy of the estimation of the blocks of the mixing matrices $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}, \tilde{\mathbf{B}}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ will be determined in terms of mean square angles between the linear space spanned by the quadruples $(\mathbf{a}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_5)$, $(\mathbf{a}_6, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_{10})$, $(\mathbf{a}_{11}, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_{15})$, $(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_5), \ldots$, $(\mathbf{c}_{11}, \ldots, \mathbf{c}_{15})$, and their estimates. The angles between the subspaces can be computed in Matlab$^{\text{TM}}$ by function "subspace".

Note that [14] uses a different measure of success in estimating a subspace, which is defined as $\min_{\mathbf{X}} \|\mathbf{S} - \hat{\mathbf{S}}\mathbf{X}\|_F^2 / \|\mathbf{S}\|_F^2$, where $\mathbf{S}$ is the desired subspace, say $\mathbf{S} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_5]$, $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$ is an estimate of $\mathbf{S}$ and $\mathbf{X}$ is an arbitrary square matrix of appropriate dimension (here 5×5). Indeed, the block-permutation ambiguity has to be resolved as well. Numerically, the results in terms of the latter criterion look similar.

Performance of TEDIA will be compared with performance of two other block-diagonalization methods: the ALS algorithm [14] and the non-linear least squares (NLS) algorithm which utilizes the Gauss-Newton algorithm with dogleg trust region [11][1]. Note that the ALS and NLS algorithm differ only in the optimization method, not in the optimization criterion, which is theoretically optimum for the given tensor model. The optimum point is identical for the two algorithms and hence the performance looks the same, except for the computational complexity. Both algorithms have in common that they need the desired block structure specified in advance, and good performance is conditioned by a good initialization.

The algorithms ALS and NLS were initialized by random orthogonal factor matrices and random core tensors. In the chosen scenario, these algorithms typically get stuck in local minima. We tried 10 random initializations for each algorithm for each generated tensor, but the subspace angular errors were large for all of them. If, however, ALS and NLS are initialized by outcome of TEDIA, they both provide good results, better than those provided by TEDIA only. Result – an average MSAE and median SAE of 100 independent trials as a function of the input SNR and parameter c of the mixing matrices are plotted in Fig. 4.

The lines for ALS and NLS overlap each other, therefore we refer only to ALS. We can see that with increasing parameter c or lowering the input SNR, the performance of the algorithm decreases. For $c \geq 0.7$ at SNR=$30dB$ the separation of blocks is practically impossible, unless the SNR is higher. The separation is perfect if there is no noise.

Finally note a remarkable differences in computation times, achieved in Matlab$^{\text{TM}}$ implementation of the algorithms on computer with 3GHz processor, displayed in Table 2. It clearly demonstrates the advantage of TEDIA.

7. Conclusion. TEDIA is the technique of non-orthogonal tensor diagonalization and block-diagonalization. It is not statistically optimum estimator of the subspaces, it is inferior to ALS [14] and NLS [11]. Its advantage is twofold: (1) it does

[1]The NLS algorithm is available in the Tensorlab toolbox, at http://www.tensorlab.net



FIG. 4. *Mean and median square angular error in dB of subspaces in partitioned factor matrices of the tensor obtained by TEDIA, and ALS initialized by the outcome of TEDIA, for* $c = 0.2$ *as a function of the input SNR (upper diagrams) and for SNR=30dB and varying* c *(lower diagrams).*

TABLE 2
Average execution time (in seconds) for decomposition of tensors with three blocks of size $5 \times 5 \times 5$ *mixed by matrices with parameter* c *versus varying* c.

algorithm \ c	0	0.20	0.40	0.60	0.80	0.90	0.95	0.98	0.99
TEDIA	4.7	3.9	3.7	3.2	2.9	3.2	4.7	7.8	7.2
TEDIA+ALS	6.0	7.1	8.0	10.6	13.4	32.0	43.1	41.9	42.6
TEDIA+NLS	7.5	12.5	11.8	9.6	16.1	116.6	340.7	367.1	366.7
Random+ALS	37.4	89.6	89.6	43.0	46.3	48.4	47.5	49.2	49.1
Random+NLS	287.3	302.5	308.7	329.1	364.4	411.8	420.7	419.6	420.5

not need to know sizes of the blocks in advance, and (2) that it finds a good solution without the unreliable multiple random initializations, and if used prior ALS or NLS, it significantly reduces the number of their iterations. Extensions of the proposed algorithm to two-sided diagonalization of the order-3 tensors or three-sided diagonalization of the order-4 tensors is straightforward [39]. Applications can be found in DS-CDMA systems or in tensor deconvolution, in particular in feature extraction and other areas.

Matlab code of the proposed technique is posted on the web page of the first author.

Appendix A. In this Appendix we present closed form expressions for elements of the Jacobi matrix (3.8) and some elements of the gradient and Hessian. The remaining elements of the gradient can be computed in the same way, details are skipped here for saving space.

The relation between the residual (core) tensor before and after executing one elementary rotation is

$$\mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \times_2 \mathbf{B}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \times_3 \mathbf{C}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$$

The (k, ℓ, m)-th element of the tensor is

$$e'_{k\ell m} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} e_{\alpha\beta\gamma} (\mathbf{A}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))_{\alpha k} (\mathbf{B}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))_{\beta\ell} (\mathbf{C}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))_{\gamma m}$$

where the summation proceeds through all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma = 1, \ldots, N$. The Jacobi matrix $\mathbf{J}$ in (3.8) has therefore the elements

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial e'_{k\ell m}}{\partial \theta_1} &= \frac{\partial e'_{k\ell m}}{\partial (\mathbf{A}_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))_{ji}} \\ &= \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} e_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \delta_{\alpha j} \delta_{ki} \delta_{\beta\ell} \delta_{\gamma m} \\ &= e_{j\ell m} \delta_{ki} \end{aligned}$$

for $k, \ell, m = 1, \ldots, N$, and similarly we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial e'_{k\ell m}}{\partial \theta_2} = e_{i\ell m} \delta_{kj}, \qquad &&\frac{\partial e'_{k\ell m}}{\partial \theta_3} = e_{kjm} \delta_{\ell i}, \qquad &&\frac{\partial e'_{k\ell m}}{\partial \theta_4} = e_{kim} \delta_{\ell j}, \\ &\frac{\partial e'_{k\ell m}}{\partial \theta_5} = e_{k\ell i} \delta_{mj}, \qquad &&\frac{\partial e'_{k\ell m}}{\partial \theta_6} = e_{k\ell j} \delta_{mi} \end{aligned}$$

The first element of the gradient in (3.7) for fixed pair (i, j) is then

$$\begin{aligned} g_1^{(i,j)} &= \sum_{(k,\ell,m) \neq (k,k,k)} \left[\frac{\partial e'_{k\ell m}}{\partial \theta_1} \right]^* e_{k\ell m} \\ &= \sum_{(k,\ell,m) \neq (k,k,k)} e^*_{j\ell m} \delta_{ki} e_{k\ell m} \\ &= \sum_{(\ell,m) \neq (i,i)} e^*_{j\ell m} e_{i\ell m} \\ &= \lambda_{ij} - e^*_{jii} e_{iii} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the other elements of the gradient can be computed. The right-upper corner element of the *Hessian* in (3.7) is

$$\begin{aligned} H_{11}^{(i,j)} &= \sum_{(k,\ell,m) \neq (k,k,k)} \left[\frac{\partial e'_{k\ell m}}{\partial \theta_1} \right]^* \frac{\partial e'_{k\ell m}}{\partial \theta_1} \\ &= \sum_{(k,\ell,m) \neq (k,k,k)} e^*_{j\ell m} \delta_{ki} e_{j\ell m} \delta_{ki} \\ &= \sum_{(\ell,m) \neq (i,i)} e^*_{j\ell m} e_{j\ell m} \\ &= \lambda_{jj} - |e_{jii}|^2 \ . \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the other elements of the Hessian can be computed.

Both the gradient and the Hessian can be computed in $O(d^2)$ operations. The update of $\mathcal{E}$, $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}$, $\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}$, and $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}$ in (3.5) also requires this amount of operations.

Appendix B. In this section explicit form of matrices $\mathbf{H}_1$ and $\mathbf{H}_2$ appearing in the perturbation analysis of TEDIA are presented. Assume that the given tensor $\mathcal{T}$ and matrices $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{C}$ are such that the tensor $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{T} \times_1 \mathbf{A} \times_2 \mathbf{B} \times_3 \mathbf{C}$ obeys the BRC (3.14). For easy reference, let us introduce the following tensors:

$$\mathcal{T}_a = \mathcal{T} \times_2 \mathbf{B} \times_3 \mathbf{C}, \qquad \mathcal{T}_b = \mathcal{T} \times_1 \mathbf{A} \times_3 \mathbf{C}, \qquad \mathcal{T}_c = \mathcal{T} \times_1 \mathbf{A} \times_2 \mathbf{B}$$
$$\mathcal{E}_a = \mathcal{E} \times_2 \mathbf{B}^T \times_3 \mathbf{C}^T, \qquad \mathcal{E}_b = \mathcal{E} \times_1 \mathbf{A}^T \times_3 \mathbf{C}^T, \qquad \mathcal{E}_c = \mathcal{E} \times_1 \mathbf{A}^T \times_2 \mathbf{B}^T .$$

Let t^a_{ijk}, t^b_{ijk}, t^c_{ijk}, e^a_{ijk}, e^b_{ijk}, e^c_{ijk}, respectively, be their (i,j,k)th elements. The matrix $\mathbf{H}_1$ is obtained by reshaping the tensor $\mathcal{H}_1$ of dimension $N \times N \times 3 \times N \times N \times 3$ with elements

$$h^{(1)}_{ij1pr1} = \delta_{pi} \sum_{(k\ell)\neq(ii)} t^a_{rk\ell} e_{jk\ell} + \delta_{pj} \sum_{(k\ell)\neq(jj)} t^a_{rk\ell} e_{ik\ell}$$
$$h^{(1)}_{ij1pr2} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} (1 - \delta_{ip}\delta_{i\ell})(t^b_{ir\ell} e_{jp\ell} + t^b_{jr\ell} e_{ip\ell})$$
$$h^{(1)}_{ij1pr3} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} (1 - \delta_{ip}\delta_{i\ell})(t^c_{i\ell r} e_{j\ell p} + t^c_{j\ell r} e_{i\ell p})$$
$$h^{(1)}_{ij2pr2} = \delta_{pi} \sum_{(k\ell)\neq(ii)} t^b_{k\ell r} e_{kj\ell} + \delta_{pj} \sum_{(k\ell)\neq(jj)} t^b_{k\ell r} e_{ki\ell}$$
$$h^{(1)}_{ij2pr1} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} (1 - \delta_{ip}\delta_{i\ell})(t^a_{ri\ell} e_{pj\ell} + t^a_{rj\ell} e_{pi\ell})$$
$$h^{(1)}_{ij2pr3} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} (1 - \delta_{ip}\delta_{i\ell})(t^c_{ri\ell} e_{\ell jp} + t^c_{rj\ell} e_{\ell ip})$$
$$h^{(1)}_{ij3pr3} = \delta_{pi} \sum_{(k\ell)\neq(ii)} t^c_{k\ell r} e_{k\ell j} + \delta_{pj} \sum_{(k\ell)\neq(jj)} t^c_{k\ell r} e_{k\ell i}$$
$$h^{(1)}_{ij3pr1} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} (1 - \delta_{ip}\delta_{i\ell})(t^a_{r\ell i} e_{p\ell j} + t^a_{r\ell j} e_{p\ell i})$$
$$h^{(1)}_{ij3pr2} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{n} (1 - \delta_{ip}\delta_{i\ell})(t^b_{\ell ri} e_{\ell pj} + t^c_{\ell rj} e_{\ell pi})$$

for $i,j,p,r = 1,\ldots,r$, $i \neq j$, and

$$h^{(1)}_{ii1ijm} = \delta_{m1}\tilde{a}_{ji}, \qquad h^{(1)}_{ii2ijm} = \delta_{m2}\tilde{b}_{ji}, \qquad h^{(1)}_{ii3ijm} = \delta_{m3}\tilde{c}_{ji} \tag{7.1}$$

for $i,j = 1,\ldots,N$ and $m = 1,2,3$; $\tilde{a}_{ji}$, $\tilde{b}_{ji}$, and $\tilde{c}_{ji}$ are the (j,i)-th elements of $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$, respectively. Matrix $\mathbf{H}_2$ is obtained by reshaping the tensor $\mathcal{H}_2$ with elements

$$h^{(2)}_{ij1k\ell m} = a_{ik} e^a_{jk\ell} + a_{jk} e^a_{ik\ell} - b_{i\ell} c_{im} (a_{ik} e_{jii} + a_{jk} e_{iii})$$
$$h^{(2)}_{ij2k\ell m} = b_{i\ell} e^b_{kjm} + b_{j\ell} e^b_{kim} - a_{ik} c_{im} (b_{i\ell} e_{iji} + b_{j\ell} e_{iii})$$
$$h^{(2)}_{ij3k\ell m} = c_{im} e^c_{k\ell j} + c_{jm} e^c_{k\ell i} - a_{ik} b_{i\ell} (c_{im} e_{iij} + c_{jm} e_{iii})$$

for $i, j, k, \ell, m = 1, \ldots, N$, $i \neq j$, and $h^{(2)}_{ijhk\ell m} = 0$ otherwise (for $i = j$, $h = 1, 2, 3$).

REFERENCES

[1] R. Bro, *Multi-way Analysis in the Food Industry Models, Algorithms, and Applications*, University of Amsterdam, http://www/models.life.ku.dk/research/theses/, 1998.

[2] P.M. Kroonenberg, *Applied Multiway Data Analysis*, Wiley, 2008.

[3] P. Comon, X. Luciani, A.L.F. de Almeida, "Tensor decompositions: alternating least squares and other tales", *Journal of Chemometrics*, 23 (August) (2009), pp. 393-405

[4] T.G. Kolda and B.W. Bader, "Tensor decompositions and applications, *SIAM Review*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 455–500, September 2009.

[5] A. Smilde, R. Bro, P. Geladi, *Multi-way Analysis: Applications in the Chemical Sciences*, Wiley, 2004.

[6] A. Cichocki, R. Zdunek, A. H. Phan and S. I. Amari, *Nonnegative Matrix and Tensor Factorizations: Applications to Exploratory Multi-way Data Analysis and Blind Source Separation*, Wiley, 2009.

[7] P. Comon, "Tensor Diagonalization, A useful Tool in Signal Processing," In M. Blanke and T. Soderstrom, editors, *IFAC-SYSID, 10th IFAC Symposium on System Identification*, vol. 1, pp. 77–82, Copenhagen, Denmark, July 4-6 1994. invited session.

[8] P. Comon, M. Sorensen, "Tensor Diagonalization by Orthogonal Transforms,", Rapport de recherche ISRN I3S/RR-2007-06-FR, Universite Nice, Sophia Antipolis.

[9] M. Sorensen, P. Comon, S. Icart, and L. Deneire, "Approximate tensor diagonalization by invertible transforms," In *EUSIPCO'09*, Glasgow, Scotland, August 24-28 2009.

[10] A.H. Phan,P. Tichavský, and A. Cichocki, "Fast Alternating LS Algorithms for High Order CANDECOMP/PARAFAC Tensor Factorizations", *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol.61, no. 19, p. 4834-4846, 2013.

[11] L. Sorber, *Data Fusion, Tensor Factorizations by Complex Optimization*, PhD Dissertation, KU Leuven, Belgium, May 2014.

[12] A. Stegeman, "Candecomp/Parafac: from diverging components to a decomposition in block terms," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 33, 291–316, 2012.

[13] L. De Lathauwer, "Decompositions of a higher-order tensor in block terms - Part II: Definitions and uniqueness", *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 1033-1066, 2008.

[14] L. De Lathauwer and D. Nion, "Decompositions of a higher-order tensor in block terms - Part III: Alternating Least Squares Algorithms", *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 1067-1083, 2008.

[15] D. Nion and L. De Lathauwer,"A Block Component Model based blind DS-CDMA receiver," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 56, no. 11, pp. 5567-5579, 2008.

[16] D. Nion and L. De Lathauwer, "A Link between the decomposition of a third-order tensor in rank-$(L, L, 1)$ terms and joint block diagonalization", *Proc. 2009 3rd IEEE International Workshop on Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing (CAMSAP)*, pp. 89–92.

[17] G. Chabriel, M. Kleinsteuber , E. Moreau, H. Shen, P. Tichavský, and A. Yeredor, "Joint Matrices Decompositions and Blind Source Separation", *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, Vol.31, No. 3, pp. 34-43, March 2014.

[18] L. De Lathauwer, "A link between the canonical decomposition in multilinear algebra and simultaneous matrix diagonalizations", *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp.642-666, 2006.

[19] L. De Lathauwer, "Computation of the canonical decomposition by means of a simultaneous generalized Schur decomposition", *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp.295–327, 2004.

[20] H. Ghennioui, F. El Mostafa, N. Thirion-Moreau, A. Adib, and E. Moreau, , "A Nonunitary Joint Block Diagonalization Algorithm for Blind Separation of Convolutive Mixtures of Sources", *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, Vol. 14, No. 11, pp. 860–863, 2007.

[21] D. Nion, "A Tensor Framework for Nonunitary Joint Block Diagonalization", *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, Vol. 59, No. 10, pp. 4585–4594, 2011.

[22] D. Lahat, J. Cardoso and H. Messer, "Second-Order Multidimensional ICA: Performance Analysis", *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, Vol. 60, No. 9, pp. 4598 - 4610, 2012.

[23] P. Tichavský, Z. Koldovský, "Algorithms for nonorthogonal approximate joint block-diagonalization", *Proc. EUSIPCO 2012*, Bucharest, Romania, August 27 - 31, 2012, pp. 2094–2098.

[24] P. Tichavský, A. Yeredor, and Z. Koldovský, "On Computation of Approximate Joint Block-

Diagonalization using Ordinary AJD", F. Theis et al. (Eds.): *LVA/ICA 2012*, LNCS 7191, pp. 163-171, 2012.

[25] A. Souloumiac, "Nonorthogonal Joint Diagonalization by Combining Givens and Hyperbolic Rotations", *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, Vol. 57, No. 6, pp. 2222–2231, 2009.

[26] L. De Lathauwer, B. De Moor, and J. Vandewalle, "On the best rank-1 and rank-(R1,R2,. . . ,RN) approximation of higher-order tensors," *SIAM Journal of Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 1324-1342, 2000.

[27] A.H. Phan, A. Cichocki, P. Tichavský, "On Fast Algorithms for Orthogonal Tucker Decomposition", *Proc. ICASSP 2014*, Florence, Italy, 4.-9.5. 2014, pp. 6816–6820.

[28] V. De Silva, L.-H. Lim, "Tensor rank and the ill-posedness of the best low-rank approximation problem," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 30, pp. 1084–1127, 2008.

[29] W.P. Krijnen, T.K. Dijkstra, and A. Stegeman, "On the non-existence of optimal solutions and the occurrence of "degeneracy" in the Candecomp/Parafac model, *Psychometrika*, vol. 73, pp. 431–439, 2008.

[30] A. H. Phan, P. Tichavský and A. Cichocki, "Low Complexity Damped Gauss-Newton Algorithms for Parallel Factor Analysis", *SIAM Journal of Matrix Analysis and Applications*, Vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 126–147, January 2013.

[31] P. Comon, J.M.F. ten Berge, L. De Lathauwer and J. Castaing, "Generic and Typical Ranks of Multi-Way Arrays", *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 430, no. 11 (2009), pp. 2997–3007, 2009.

[32] J B Kruskal, "Rank, decomposition, and uniqueness for 3-way and N-way arrays" in *Multiway data analysis*, pp. 718, North-Holland (Amsterdam), 1989.

[33] G. Gan, C. Ma, and J. Wu, *Data Clustering Theory, Algorithms, and Applications*, SIAM, 2007.

[34] A.H. Phan, P. Tichavský, A. Cichocki, and Z.Koldovský "Low rank blind nonnegative matrix deconvolution", *Proc. ICASSP 2012*, Kyoto, Japan, pp. 1893–1896.

[35] P. Tichavský, A.H. Phan, Z. Koldovský, "Cramér–Rao–Induced Bounds for CANDECOMP/PARAFAC tensor decomposition", *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 61, no. 8, pp. 1986–1997, April 2013.

[36] P. Tichavský and A. Yeredor, "Fast Approximate Joint Diagonalization Incorporating Weight Matrices", *IEEE Tr. on Signal Processing*, vol. 57, no.3, pp. 878-891, March 2009.

[37] E. Cuthill and J. McKee, "Reducing the bandwidth of sparse symmetric matrices", *Proc. 24th Nat. Conf. ACM*, pp. 157172, 1969.

[38] Christopher J. Hillar, Lek-Heng Lim, "Most Tensor Problems Are NP-Hard", *Journal of the ACM* , Volume 60 Issue 6, article 45, 39pp, November 2013.

[39] P. Tichavský, A.H. Phan, A. Cichocki, "Tensor diagonalization - a new tool for PARAFAC and block-term decomposition", http://arxiv.org/abs/1402.1673

[40] A.H. Phan, P. Tichavský, A. Cichocki, "Low Rank Tensor Deconvolution", *Proc. ICASSP 2015*, Brisbane.